

REMARKS

Claims 5-6, 10, 14-15, and 19 were indicated to be allowable by the Examiner if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. New claims 21 and 22 have been presented and rewrite original claims 5 and 10, respectively. Therefore, it is believed that these claims are allowable and notification to that effect is requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18, and 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Soumiya et al. Applicants respectfully traverse. The Examiner characterizes Soumiya by stating that it discloses a process “comprising forming an aqueous zirconium oxychloride and stabilizer solution, hydrolysis, and calcining (abstract)”. The Abstract, however, does not state that. Instead, the Abstract states that it is a process that includes the steps of “mixing an aluminum salt or an alumina hydrate with an aqueous zirconium oxychloride solution, with or without metal salt acting as a stabilizer; mixing urea or a substance capable of generating urea by hydrolysis with the resulting mixture; and allowing the mixture to react” Thus, the hydrolysis refers to a substance that is capable of generating ammonia by hydrolysis. Hydrolysis in the Soumiya patent does not refer to the hydrolysis of the claimed aqueous solution.

Moreover, if the Examiner contends that the ammonia of Soumiya is the equivalent of the claimed intermediate, Soumiya does not teach calcining of ammonia. Therefore, Soumiya does not teach or suggest each and every element require by the claims.

Furthermore, the Examiner appears to select disparate portions of Soumiya to arrive at Applicants' claimed process. For example, the Examiner states that Soumiya

discloses hydrolysis (abstract), and spray drying (see column 2, lines 55-57) and 120 degrees Celsius (Example 1). While it is true that Soumiya does disclose these disparate elements, Soumiya does not suggest or teach that each be conducted in a single process. The hydrolysis has been discussed above. With respect to spray drying, Soumiya teaches that it is used to simply dry the reaction product. In other words, the Soumiya spray drying is not used to create the reaction product, as in the claimed process. As for the 120° C in Example 1 of Soumiya, this temperature refers to drying for 12 hours. Certainly drying for 12 hours at 120°C does not suggest a spray drying process. Rather, it suggests a hot air drying process or some other type of drying process. Therefore, Soumiya does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed process. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18, and 20 were also rejected as being anticipated by Hamling. Applicants respectfully traverse. As an initial matter, it appears that the Examiner contends that the igniting of Hamling is the equivalent of the calcining of the claimed process. Applicants cannot agree. Ignition relates to combustion or setting on fire; whereas calcining refers to heating or roasting at a high temperature. Calcining does not relate to ignition. Therefore, it is not seen how Hamling teaches or suggests each and every step of the claimed process. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

USSN 10/053,177
Response to September 29, 2003 Office Action
10225/21

If, for any reason, the Examiner feels that the above amendments and remarks do not put the claims in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney can be reached at (312) 321-4276 to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,



G. Peter Nichols
Registration No. 34,401

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200